

#13 And B
SNW 2-22-02

PATENT
Application of JAVORS, Russell
Ser. No. 09/497,244
Attorney Docket No. 3910.164

AMENDMENT

In the Claims

Please cancel Claim 12, without prejudice.

RECEIVED
FEB 6 2002
Technology Center 2600

REMARKS

Claims 2 - 9, 11, 12, and 24 – 36 are pending in the application.

The Objection to Claim 5

Applicant submits that Claim 5, rejected as being informal, is correct as written, i.e., the double “at” is intended. The first “at” should be read apart from the phrase “at least one input”, i.e., “at” “at least one input.”

Double Patenting

Claims 2 - 9, 11 - 12 and 24 - 36 were rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of double patenting. A Terminal Disclaimer is filed herewith without admission of the propriety of the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2 - 9, 11 – 12 and 24 - 36 under 35 USC §§ 103(a) as assertedly obvious over Drori et al., U.S. patent 4,887,064 (“Drori”) in view of Wu, U.S. patent 4,925,427 (“Wu”). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Drori discloses a multi-featured security system with self-diagnostic capability for protected areas such as vehicles. Wu discloses a toy car which converts from a normal car to a police car in pursuit of a criminal, (col. 1, lines 6 – 10, Figures 1 and 5, etc.) and includes policemen projecting out from the windows to fire upon the